REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action,

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the

and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this

application.

Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 14.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Nii (U.S. Patent No. 5,804,947),

hereinafter "Nii" in view of Skrzypek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,645,017), hereinafter "Skrzypek".

For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The

asserted combination of Nii in view of Skrzypek, independently or in combination, does not

teach or suggest all features of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, Nii does not teach that the inverter permits an output current to be

"higher than said charging current in a first operating mode..." as required in claim 1.

Additionally, Nii does not teach that the inverter "limits said output current...in a second

operating mode" as required in claim 1. Thirdly, Nii does not teach that the inverter "[maintains]

the torque for said motor in a second operating mode" as required in claim 1. Furthermore, these

deficiencies of Nii are not taught or suggested in the disclosure of Skrzypek. Therefore, even if

Nii were combined with Skrzypek, every limitation of claim 1 would not be taught, suggested, or

otherwise rendered obvious or predictable by the resulting combination.

The remaining dependent claims 2-13, are allowable for the limitations therein and for

the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

Page 8 of 9

Reply to Office action dated September 15, 2008

In regard to claim 14, Nii does not teach that the inverter "limits said output current...in a

second operating mode" as required in claim 14. Also, Nii does not teach that the inverter

"during a second operating mode, [retains] the torque to said apparatus" as required by claim 14.

Furthermore, these deficiencies of Nii are not taught or suggested in the disclosure of Skrzypek.

As a result, even if Nii were combined with Skrzypek, every limitation of claim 14 would not be

taught, suggested, or otherwise rendered obvious or predictable by the resulting combination.

The remaining dependent claims 15-16, are allowable for the limitations therein and for

the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a

condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone

interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to

our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 39334.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

Date: December 12, 2008

By: \_\_\_/michaelwgarvey/\_

Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street Suite 1200

Suite 1200 Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108

(216) 579-1700

Page 9 of 9